



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/859,711	05/17/2001	Thomas E. Chefalas	YOR920010329US1	4104
54105	7590	03/01/2007	EXAMINER	
DUKE W. YEE			JUNG, DAVID YIUK	
YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.				
P.O. BOX 802333			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DALLAS, TX 75380			2134	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Notice of Abandonment

Application No.

09/859,711

Examiner

David Y. Jung

Applicant(s)

CHEFALAS ET AL.

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

This application is abandoned in view of:

1. ☒ Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office letter mailed on 13 June 2006.
  - (a) ☐ A reply was received on \_\_\_\_\_ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated \_\_\_\_\_), which is after the expiration of the period for reply (including a total extension of time of \_\_\_\_\_ month(s)) which expired on \_\_\_\_\_.
  - (b) ☐ A proposed reply was received on \_\_\_\_\_, but it does not constitute a proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (a) to the final rejection.  
(A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection consists only of: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114).
  - (c) ☒ A reply was received on tel calls/emails but it does not constitute a proper reply, or a bona fide attempt at a proper reply, to the non-final rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (See explanation in box 7 below).
  - (d) ☐ No reply has been received.
2. ☐ Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, within the statutory period of three months from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85).
  - (a) ☐ The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was received on \_\_\_\_\_ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated \_\_\_\_\_), which is after the expiration of the statutory period for payment of the issue fee (and publication fee) set in the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85).
  - (b) ☐ The submitted fee of \$\_\_\_\_\_ is insufficient. A balance of \$\_\_\_\_\_ is due.  
The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$\_\_\_\_\_. The publication fee, if required by 37 CFR 1.18(d), is \$\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (c) ☐ The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has not been received.
3. ☐ Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as required by, and within the three-month period set in, the Notice of Allowability (PTO-37).
  - (a) ☐ Proposed corrected drawings were received on \_\_\_\_\_ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated \_\_\_\_\_), which is after the expiration of the period for reply.
  - (b) ☐ No corrected drawings have been received.
4. ☐ The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the attorney or agent of record, the assignee of the entire interest, or all of the applicants.
5. ☐ The letter of express abandonment which is signed by an attorney or agent (acting in a representative capacity under 37 CFR 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application.
6. ☐ The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference rendered on \_\_\_\_\_ and because the period for seeking court review of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claims.
7. ☒ The reason(s) below:

see attached

Jung 2/24/07

Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdraw the holding of abandonment under 37 CFR 1.181, should be promptly filed to minimize any negative effects on patent term.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This case is abandoned.

A few days before the three month period for response to the previous Office Action expired, Applicant's representative (Mr. Francis Lammes) spoke with the examiner. The examiner agreed that the content of the previous Office Action contained errors. The examiner has subsequently tried to send a new Office Action.

After several efforts by the examiner, the examiner has still not obtained the authority to send a new Office Action. Indeed, the examiner has subsequently learned that the examiner does not have the authority to send a new Office Action unless Applicant sends a response (e.g., a "request for reconsideration" which points out the errors in the content of the Office Action and which requests a reconsideration by the examiner such that the examiner can send a new Office Action which corrects the errors). In other words, neither the examiner nor Applicant knew that the examiner never had the authority.

Thus, Applicant is directed to 37 CFR 1.137 and 37 CFR 1.181 which deal with petitions. 37 CFR 1.137, of course, deals with petitions to revive this patent application. 37 1.181 deals with petitions to withdraw abandonment. Whether a petition should be granted is, of course, not a matter for the examiner.

Because of the lack of success of the examiner in sending a new Office Action, Applicant has never had access to the Office Action that would have been sent if the examiner had success. Thus, the examiner hereby provides the rejection that the examiner would have sent.

Art Unit: 2134

Claims 1-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over [http://www.verisign.com/support/tlc/class3\\_install\\_docs/netscape/v00g.html](http://www.verisign.com/support/tlc/class3_install_docs/netscape/v00g.html) ("Verisign") and <http://www-2.cs.cmu.edu/~dmaltz/main-report/node7.html#SECTION00420000000000000000> (Matz) and <http://archives.cnn.com/2000/TECH/computing/05/15/chat.anonymous.idg/index.html> (CNN).

Regarding claim 1, Verisign teaches "A method in a data processing system for an organization to provide anonymity to a user, the method comprising the data processing system implemented steps of: receiving a request from the user for an anonymous identity; generating the anonymous identity for the user, wherein the anonymous identity includes contact information for the organization; associating the anonymous identity with the user, wherein the user uses the anonymous identify to provide information on a network data processing system; receiving a contact directed to the anonymous identity; and ... (section "Activating SSL encryption", i.e. selecting alias for the key-pair file)."

These passages of Verisign do not teach "selectively forwarding the contact to the user based on a policy" in the sense of the claim.

Matz teaches "selectively forwarding the contact to the user based on a policy (the second paragraph, i.e. user-profile based or rule based filters) for the motivation of having select for a user (the first paragraph).

Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine the teachings of Verisign and Matz for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

These passages of Verisign and Matz do not teach "anonymous identity" in the sense of the claim.

CNN teaches such "anonymous identity (the first three paragraphs, anonymity of John Doe being guaranteed and the identity of John Doe being released only after a legal subpoena)" for the motivation of privacy (the fourth paragraph, i.e. ACLU and Electronic Privacy Information Center).

Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine the teachings of Verisign and Matz and CNN for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 2 (Web server, etc.), such particular features are well known in the art for the purpose of handling information across computers.

Regarding claim 3 (billing, etc.), such particular features are well known in the art for the purpose of e-commerce across computers. Regarding claims 4-13, such particular features are well known in the art for the purpose of handling information across computers.

Regarding claim 14, Verisign teaches "A method in a data processing system for providing anonymity to a user, the method comprising the data processing system implemented steps of: receiving a contact, wherein the contact includes an identification of an entity; comparing the identification of an entity in the contact to a database of ...; and responsive to identifying the user, (section "Activating SSL encryption", i.e. selecting alias for the key-pair file)."

These passages of Verisign do not teach "selectively forwarding the contact to the user based on a policy" in the sense of the claim.

Matz teaches "selectively forwarding the contact to the user based on a policy (the second paragraph, i.e. user-profile based or rule based filters) for the motivation of having select for a user (the first paragraph).

Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine Verisign and Matz for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

These passages of Verisign and Matz do not teach "aliases" in the sense of the claim.

CNN teaches such "aliases (the first three paragraphs, anonymity of John Doe being guaranteed and the identity of John Doe being released only after a legal subpoena)" for the motivation of privacy (the fourth paragraph, i.e. ACLU and Electronic Privacy Information Center).

Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine the teachings of Verisign and Matz and CNN for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 2134

Regarding claims 15-76, such particular features are well known in the art for the purpose of handling information across computers.

Regarding claim 77, Verisign teaches "A computer program product in a computer readable medium for providing anonymity to a user, the computer program product comprising: first instructions for receiving a contact, wherein the contact includes an identification of an entity; second instructions for comparing the identification of an entity in the contact to a database of ...; and third instructions, responsive to identifying the user, for ... (section "Activating SSL encryption", i.e. selecting alias for the key-pair file)."

These passages of Verisign do not teach "selectively forwarding the contact to the user based on a policy" in the sense of the claim.

Matz teaches "selectively forwarding the contact to the user based on a policy (the second paragraph, i.e. user-profile based or rule based filters) for the motivation of having select for a user (the first paragraph).

Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine Verisign and Matz for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

These passages of Verisign and Matz do not teach "aliases" in the sense of the claim.

CNN teaches such "aliases (the first three paragraphs, anonymity of John Doe being guaranteed and the identity of John Doe being released only after a legal subpoena)" for the motivation of privacy (the fourth paragraph, i.e. ACLU and Electronic Privacy Information Center).

Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine the teachings of Verisign and Matz and CNN for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

Regarding claims 77-84, such particular features are well known in the art for the purpose of handling information across computers.

Regarding claim 85 (billing, etc.) such particular features are well known in the art for the purpose of commerce.

### ***Conclusion***

### ***Points of Contact***

While an inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner may be directed to David Jung whose telephone number is (571) 272-3836, Applicant is directed to 37 CFR 1.137 and 37 CFR 1.181 which deal with petitions. As noted in the previous paragraphs, the response to this Office Action of abandonment (as a petition is likely) appears to be a petition. Whether a petition should be granted is, of course, not a matter for the examiner.

Art Unit: 2134

David Jung

-----

Patent Examiner

2/24/07

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a series of loops and a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.